Special Issue Reviewing Rockefeller's Record As A Hawk

Identical Twins

"Washington, July 7 (UPI)—Vice President Humphrey said today that the biggest issue in the Presidential campaign was crime and violence in America's streets."
—*New York Times, July 8.*

"Washington, July 8—Senator John G. Tower, chairman of Richard Nixon's 'Key Issues Committee' today called crime and disorder the No. 1 issue of the campaign."
—*New York Times, July 9.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVI, NO. 15 JULY 22, 1968 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

The Candidate Least Likely To Make Peace

I

The question raised by Governor Rockefeller's 4-stage plan for peace in Vietnam is whether you can sell the Brooklyn Bridge a second time to the same sucker. Essentially it asks Ho Chi Minh again to call off the war and withdraw his men on the same promise of free elections later. The Rockefeller plan is the 1954 Geneva settlement all over again. Once Ho withdrew his forces after 1954, he had no leverage to make us keep the Geneva promise of elections and reunification. He would be in an even weaker position this time, militarily and politically.

A Lopsided Proposal

Under the devious wording of the Rockefeller plan, Ho would withdraw all his forces but we would not withdraw all of ours. As he withdrew his forces, we would withdraw "the bulk" of ours. "The small U.S. forces left in Vietnam," the Rockefeller plan says, "would be confined to fixed installations as long as North Vietnam carries out its commitments."* Thus an undetermined number of U.S. troops would remain in bases around the country. These forces would not leave until after the elections. Only our side would have the means of enforcing the terms of the settlement. U.S. troops could move into action from their bases on any violation, real, imagined or contrived.

The Rockefeller plan is as lopsided politically. In the 1954 agreement there was no restriction on those who could participate in the promised elections. We decided not to hold the elections because we knew that Ho and the Communists would win. One way to prevent such a victory this time would be to exclude the Communists. The Rockefeller plan says the NLF will be "guaranteed participation in the political life of the country" only when it "ceases guerrilla operations and agrees to abide by the democratic process." That means the guerrillas would have to give up their arms and then satisfy the governing authority in the South that they would "abide by the democratic process" before they could campaign and vote. This governing authority under the Rockefeller plan would be left to the existing regime in Saigon, with its rigged Constitution and its repressive election laws under which Communists and "pro-Communists" are excluded.

What does the phrase—"to abide by the democratic process"—in the Rockefeller plan mean? Saigon has long had an "open arms" program for Communists and other NLF members who defect. When the Saigon military in charge of the defector camps are convinced the VC have renounced their past views, they are set free to participate in the normal life of the country. Does Rockefeller mean any more than this? In a *U.S. News & World Report* interview June 24, Rockefeller was questioned about an earlier proposal to broaden the base of the Saigon government. "Are you talking," he was asked, "about bringing in the Viet Cong or the National Liber-

(*Continued on Page Two*)

When It's Dangerous to Oppose Arson

More than 2500 persons have signed the "Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority" which was the heart of the case against Dr. Spock and his three convicted colleagues of the anti-draft movement. So strong is the anti-war sentiment that for the first time in American history a war-time President has virtually abdicated rather than risk condemnation at the polls. If Dr. Spock's was a crime, there are not enough jails to hold all those who ought to be there with him. His counsel, Leonard Boudin, in a plea before sentence, was hardly exaggerating when he quoted Burke's speech on Conciliation. "It seems to me narrow and pedantic," Burke said of the resistance sweeping the American Colonies, "to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to this great public contest." No Tory judge was more fiercely biased than Judge Ford; the severity of the two-year sentence for what was little more than an expression of opinion matched his ill-tempered conduct of the trial. Judge Ford called their action akin to treason, but history will decide that the treason to America's welfare and traditions was the government's. Dr. Spock's defiance is the crown of his career. "There's no point in raising children," he said with devastating simplicity some years ago, "if they're going to be burned alive." In a time when America has been led to believe that its safety lies in its capacity to deal out instant immolation, whether by napalm or H-bomb, what could be more incendiary than to attack institutionalized arson?

* See text Washington Post July 14.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued From Page One*)

ation Front?" "No," was his answer, "I said democratic elements and I do not consider the Viet Cong a democratic element."

Additional light is thrown on what Rockefeller has in mind by his newly published campaign book, "Unity, Freedom & Peace: A Blueprint for Tomorrow." In it he says we should "accept in South Vietnam's political life any group that seeks its objectives through the political process, rather than by pursuing them by force *or subversion.*" (Emphasis added.) On ABC-TV's *Issues and Answers* July 14, the day after his new plan was released, Rockefeller put forward the same formula again. He said the Viet Cong could participate in the election "if they agree to drop military action and subversion." You can stop military action by a cease-fire but how do you stop "subversion"?

What Is Subversion?

At one time Rockefeller said he would accept even a Viet Cong government in South Vietnam if it was the result of truly free elections. Now he says the Viet Cong cannot take part in elections until they give up "force and subversion." What is subversion? The New Deal was constantly attacked as subversive. Even the ADA was labelled subversive during the witch-hunt years of the 40s and 50s. In Saigon subversion is anything which threatens the domination of the military junta and the landlord-gentry class. It only took a Saigon court 23 minutes the other day to find the leaders of the new middle class "Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace Forces" guilty of subversion *in absentia,* and condemn them to death for it. If the NLF has to satisfy the Saigon regime that it has given up "subversion" before it can participate in the political process, it may have to wait a long time.

In the 1954 agreement there was a provision that no one was to be persecuted for the part he had played in the struggle against the French and their puppets, Diem violated it and sparked the rebellion when he began to throw many of the former Viet Minh fighters into concentration camps. This time there would be no guarantee that the Viet Cong, after laying down their arms, might not end up in jail again because they had not convinced the Saigon regime that they had sincerely given up "subversion." Thieu and Ky couldn't have thought up a cuter peace offer.

II

Nelson Rockefeller is as tricky as Nixon and as glib in his liberalism as Humphrey. For a quarter of a century he has been, if anything, more consistently and ferociously dedicated than either to the cold war and its anti-Communist obsessions. Of all the candidates he is the one least likely to draw back from our costly effort to become the policeman of the world. His position on civil rights is liberal—it could hardly be otherwise to get anywhere in the politics of New York—but liberals fool themselves if they think he would cut down military expenditure for social reconstruction. No major figure in American politics has worked harder than Rockefeller to push ever higher the billions we allocate to the Pentagon. To woo the Kennedy forces and exploit peace sentiment, Rockefeller has reluctantly and belatedly been persuaded to coo like a dove. But his whole record spells hawk.

No one can be more surprised than Eisenhower to hear Rockefeller trying to sound like a peace candidate. During the last Republican administration, Eisenhower was not cold warrish enough for Rockefeller and they split because Rockefeller did not think he was spending enough on the armed forces. In June, 1960, Rockefeller refused to join other Republican Governors in supporting Nixon as Eisenhower's successor. Rockefeller issued an almost hysterical statement at the Governors' conference in which he said we faced a "national catastrophe" unless we quickly stepped up our military efforts. Rockefeller had been urging an increase of at least $3 billion a year in the military budget. He did not come out for Nixon until the latter at a secret meeting in July agreed to support the demand for bigger arms expenditures. "There must be no price ceiling," said the joint statement which sealed their bargain, "on America's security."

Eisenhower in his memoirs, "Waging Peace", said this statement "seemed somewhat astonishing, coming as it did from two people who had long been in administration councils and who had never voiced any doubt—at least in my presence—of the adequacy of America's defenses." Eisenhower noted that the Pentagon's budget had risen from "less than $12 billion before the Korean war under the Democrats to more than $41 billion in 1960." He pointed to the new supersonic jets of the Air Force and the "revolutionary new submarine-borne Polaris missiles" of the Navy as solid evidence of increased military strength. He related that after Rockefeller's "catastrophe" statement in June, 1960, Eisenhower dryly told a meeting of Congressional leaders at the White House, "I suspect that Rockefeller has been listening too closely to half-baked advisers."

One of those "half-baked advisers" was Dr. Edward Teller. He was the one scientist on the panel which, under Nelson's chairmanship, wrote the famous Rockefeller Brothers Report on "International Security: The Military Aspect" in 1958. This was a blueprint for a U.S. role as world policeman in the

Belt-Tightening Time In Congress

Sen. CLARK: I wonder what happened [in conference] to the money for the special summer programs under the poverty setup.

Sen. PASTORE: Does the Senator mean food for the undernourished children in day camps?

Sen. CLARK: Yes.

Sen. PASTORE: On that item, the amount allowed was $10 million.

Sen. CLARK: What was the amount requested by the Senator [in conference]?

Sen. PASTORE: . . . $32 million. . . . With reference to the neighborhood youth program, which is summer jobs, the amount [the Senate] inserted in the bill was $75 million. . . . [In conference] we got $13 million, which to me was a virtual victory. . . . With respect to the Headstart program, the amount sought was $25 million. . . . On that, we finally could reach a figure of only $5 million. . . .

Sen. CLARK: How much is there in this bill for Vietnam and other military affairs?

Sen. PASTORE: Almost $4 billion for Southeast Asia. Our committee decided to cut out $80.3 million for military construction in Vietnam . . . [but] the House was adamant in restoring the full amount.

—Senate debate July 2 on the second supplemental appropriations bill, which passed 64 to 1 with only Nelson (D.-Wisc.) *voting against it.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nuclear age. The Strangelovian touch of Dr. Teller was exquisitely visible in the report's most wondrous sentence. "Very powerful nuclear weapons," it said, "can be used in such a manner that they have negligible effects on civilian populations" Such was the Pied Piperism Rockefeller was prepared to follow. The report called for the complete reorganization of the armed forces. One innovation charted the course to a whole series of Vietnams. It called for mobile forces "tailored to the gamut of possible limited wars which may range from conflicts involving several countries to minor police actions." These limited war forces "may require a highly complicated weapons system *including nuclear weapons.*" (Emphasis added.) This readiness to use nuclear weapons in limited wars anticipated Goldwater by six years, though Goldwater suggested nuclear weapons in Vietnam for defoliation purposes only, not—as the Rockefeller report did—for combat.

Aggression You Don't See, Hear or Feel

Two years before the NLF was organized in 1960, Rockefeller was ready for intervention in Vietnam. "Our security can be imperilled," his report warned in 1958, "not only by overt aggression but also by transformations which are made to appear, insofar as possible, as not aggression at all." Greece, it said, "has furnished one example, Vietnam another." The report invented the phrase "non-overt aggression", i.e. an aggression of which there is no proof in overt act, only a hunch that something bad is going on. Interventionism never developed a more useful, if paradoxical, doctrine. The report asked us to "realize that non-overt aggression presents issues which are deliberately and intrinsically unclear" and to recognize that "to ask for certainty in these situations is a recipe for inaction." This implies that we must be ready to resolve any doubts in favor of intervention. There is an occult quality about the phrase "non-overt aggression" which recalls the demonology of the cold war and the witch hunt years in their most virulent phase.

III

The fact is that Rockefeller has always been more comfortable with the cold war liberal Democrats than with the conservative Eisenhower-type Republicans. His "liberalism" is the same mixture of social demagogy at home and military intervention abroad which has characterized Democratic policy from Truman to Johnson and Humphrey. Rockefeller can claim to be the original cold warrior. He boasts in his new book that he was called anti-Russian and pro-Fascist when he fought successfully at the UN organizing meeting in San Francisco in 1945 to admit Fascist Argentina to membership over Molotov's objections—and those of men on our side as diverse as Secretary of State Hull and Walter Lippmann. This signalled the first efforts to use the new organization as an anti-Soviet bloc. Rockefeller also boasts of the part he played in the adoption of Article 51 of the Charter, which allowed for "regional groupings" within the UN. Originally it was represented as an effort to preserve the Monroe Doctrine but it led to the very development the United Nations was intended to avoid—the breakup of the world into hostile military blocs. Rockefeller now boasts that it was Article 51 which four years later made the formation of NATO possible. Article 51 also laid the basis for SEATO.

It is not surprising that in his new book the President for whom Rockefeller expresses the greatest admiration is Truman. Rockefeller admires Truman because he "decided to reverse President Roosevelt's policy of accommodation with the Kremlin, decided to terminate World War II by dropping two atomic bombs on Japan, [and] decided to contain Soviet expansion into the Mediterranean by offering the Truman Doctrine to Greece and Turkey." In foreign policy Rockefeller has always felt more at home with the Democrats. Much of the military program sketched out in the Rockefeller report of 1958 was implemented by the Kennedy Administration; one of Kennedy's first acts was to send Congress a special message boosting military spending; by fiscal 1962 it was $10 billion more than Eisenhower's 1960 figure of 41 billion. Since, of course, it has been doubled by the Vietnamese war. But Kennedy wasn't belligerent enough for Rockefeller. Rockefeller attacked him for suggesting that we give up Quemoy and Matsu; these tiny Chinese offshore islands seemed to Rockefeller "of tremendous significance" to "the defense of freedom." He criticized Kennedy for not being more aggressive in Laos and Vietnam, accused the new President of mishandling nuclear defenses in "several secret exchanges of letters" with Khrushchev and after the Bay of Pigs wanted him to make another attempt to topple Castro. He was for intervention in the Congo to prevent a Communist takeover during the scare created by poor Lumumba's effort at independence.

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Advice He Prefers Not To Hear

"Defense experts both in and outside the Government have told Congressional Quarterly that huge cuts can be made in the defense budget while retaining or even improving the current level of the national defense. Highly placed sources in the Pentagon and industry told CQ that cuts totaling at least $10.8 billion could be made in areas they classified as 'fat.'"

—Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, *June 28 (reprinted in July 3* Cong. Record, *S 8184).*

"It is a mistake to assume that when the war is over in Vietnam there will be a sharp and substantial drop in defense expenditures."

—Clifford at press conference, July 11.

Naval Intelligence Officer, Fresh From Vietnam, On The Ghoulish Folly of The Body Count

"Some U.S. combat units really count bodies; others probably never do, but under pressure from higher up, report whatever 'body count' would be expected. . . . If we are trying to convince someone that we are winning the war because the enemy is losing more men than we are, we are on the wrong side of history. If this were true, the Confederacy should have won the Civil War and the Allies should have lost both world wars. . . .

"Apart from the impression we are creating world-wide that we are ghouls obsessed with the gruesome stacking and counting of cadavers, the danger is very real of falling victim to our own inflated statistics."

—Lt. Col. R. A. McMahon in Army magazine for July.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rockefeller Feared the Nuclear Test Ban Might Lead to Disarmament

(*Continued from Page Three*)

Rockefeller is incautious enough in his new book to give himself high marks for courage because he was dubious about the nuclear test ban agreement Kennedy negotiated. He wanted assurances that the treaty "does not prohibit the use of nuclear weapons to repel aggression anywhere" and that the Kennedy Administration—rather than use the treaty as a first step toward broader disarmament measures, as was hoped at the time—would "take every feasible step to preserve the ability of our military establishment to deter and defeat Communist aggression against free peoples everywhere." Like his scientist mentor Dr. Teller, Rockefeller feared nothing so much as a detente. In this he saw eye to eye with the military. It is in keeping with this record that Rockefeller in a chapter on "Fiscal Integrity" in the new book nowhere suggests any cut in military expenditures or in the escalating costs of the Vietnamese war. He says we will have to "discipline ourselves to set clear priorities and to make hard choices" which will demand "rare political courage." But he lacks the courage to specify what are the hard choices he would make if elected. His whole record shows that for him military strength comes first, and that military strength is not merely defense but a capacity for intervention anywhere in the world.

Not Strange He Admires LBJ

It is not strange that Rockefeller's admiration for Johnson comes through in the new book. He praises Johnson's "self-sacrifice" in renouncing renomination and sees it as a "courageous" step toward "the ending of our own, increasingly malignant controversy between 'hawks' and 'doves' and a long step toward the restoration of national unity." His only criticism is that Johnson's "peace overtures to North Vietnam were launched in a manner to stir concern among our friends in Southeast Asia who now feel themselves directly menaced." He sets out to correct this. He writes:

I would warn our adversaries not to 'overact' to our current discomfiture in foreign relations. In commencing our new quest for honorable peace in Vietnam, we are expressing a sober reassessment, not seeking peace at any price. At stake in this judgment is not only peace in Vietnam but the chances of peace in Asia, the Middle East and the whole world. Our adversaries ought not to conclude that we will be unable to devise an effective strategy against their 'wars of national liberation' i.e. subversion, or that other peoples less weakened than the South Vietnamese will not rise up against incursion and intrusion.

These opaque phrases could have come as easily from Rusk or Johnson. They suggest no more than a tactical retreat. If the military have their way, the retreat will be no more than enough palaver at Paris to keep the home front quiet until after the election when they can go on with the war undisturbed. Rockefeller speaks of a "sober reassessment" but there is no hint that this would extend to the wisdom of our involvement in land and civil wars in Asia, much less to the idea of trying to impose a Pax Americana. On the contrary Rockefeller in a speech in Philadelphia on May 1 unveiled a grandiose vision of a new regional grouping under American leadership which would ensure "economic progress and political stability" for all the Asian "hundreds of millions living in the great crescent from Japan throughout India to Iran." This is a sure way to more and bigger than Asian Vietnams. *July 16*

The "But" Which Led To The Vietnamese War

"We are not the world's policeman. How peoples wish to govern themselves, and how they wish to change their governments—that's their business. Our interest runs only to avoiding the kinds of violence which can transcend national frontiers and threaten the wider peace. Second, we also have to recognize that, whatever our own intentions, others may be prepared to violate frontiers and foster local turmoil [as in Vietnam?] for their own ends. We must therefore be prepared to fulfill specific and clearly defined mutual defense commitments approved by the President and the Congress of the United States."

—Humphrey's speech of July 12 designed to give him a new look in foreign policy. The excerpt shows that he ends up sounding like Rusk and Johnson.

If You Enjoyed Stone's New Book, You Might Like A Copy of His Earlier Collection, "The Haunted Fifties" Out of Print in This Country—A Few Copies of The English Edition Are Now Available at The Original Cut Price of $4.95

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, **In A Time of Torment** (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 7/22/68

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED